| | Case 1:23-cv-00973-JLT-GSA Documer | nt 27 Filed 10/29/24 Page 1 of 4 |
|----------|------------------------------------|--|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN I | DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | CHARLENE STITH, | No. 1:23-cv-00947 KES GSA (PC) |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO FILE RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION |
| 13 | v. | TO DISMISS |
| 14 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., | (ECF No. 27) |
| 15 | Defendants. | PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, OR, |
| 16 | | IN THE ALTERNATIVE, A STATEMENT OF NON-OPPOSITION TO IT, DUE IN THIRTY |
| 17 | | DAYS |
| 18 | VICTORIA GREEN, | No. 1:23-cv-00973 KES GSA (PC) |
| 19 20 | Plaintiff, | ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO FILE |
| 20 | v. | RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS |
| 22 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., | (ECF No. 24) |
| 23 | Defendants. | PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO |
| 24 | | DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, A STATEMENT OF |
| 25 | | NON-OPPOSITION TO IT, DUE IN THIRTY DAYS |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | 1 |
| | | |

Case 1:23-cv-00973-JLT-GSA Document 27 Filed 10/29/24 Page 2 of 4

| 1 | RAYSHAWN HART, | No. 1:23-cv-00977 KES GSA (PC) |
|--------|------------------------------|---|
| 2 | , | |
| 3 | Plaintiff, v. | ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO FILE RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS |
| 4 5 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., | (ECF No. 21) |
| 6 | Defendants. | PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, OR, |
| 7 | | IN THE ALTERNATIVE, A STATEMENT OF NON-OPPOSITION TO IT, DUE IN THIRTY DAYS |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | ZENAIDA CORDOVA | No. 1:24-cv-00482 KES GSA (PC) |
| 10 | Plaintiff, | ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO FILE |
| 11 | v. | RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS |
| 12 | GREG RODRIGUEZ, et al., | (ECF No. 16) |
| 13 | Defendants. | PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO |
| 14 | | DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, A STATEMENT OF |
| 15 | | NON-OPPOSITION TO IT, DUE IN THIRTY DAYS |
| 16 | | |
| | II | |

Plaintiffs in the above-referenced cases are state prisoners who have filed civil rights actions seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. All Plaintiffs are represented by the same counsel. These matters were referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

For the reasons stated below, the above-referenced Plaintiffs will be ordered to file responses to Defendants' motions to dismiss, or, in the alternative, statements of non-opposition to them. Plaintiffs will be given thirty days to take either course of action.

I. <u>RELEVANT FACTS</u>

On October 1, 2024, Defendants in each of the above-referenced matters filed motions to dismiss. See Stith, ECF No. 27; Green, ECF No. 24; Hart, ECF No. 21, and Cordova, ECF No. 16. Recently, these cases have been referred to District Judge Jennifer L. Thurston, and all dates

previously set for these matters on the previously assigned District Judge's calendar have been vacated. See Stith, ECF No. 28; Green, ECF No. 25; Hart, ECF No. 22, and Cordova, ECF No. 17.

II. DISCUSSION

In total, nine cases have been related in these proceedings. All Plaintiffs are different in each case, but many of the named Defendants are the same.

To date, motions to dismiss have been filed by Defendants in four of the other matters, and they have been fully briefed. See generally Robertson v. State of California, No. 1:23-cv-00975 JLT GSA; Lipsy v. State of California, No. 1:23-cv-00976 JLT GSA; Graham v. State of California, No. 1:23-cv-01323 JLT GSA, and Purdagone v. State of California, No. 1:23-cv-01324. The Court will consider Defendants' motions on the papers in these cases. In the ninth matter, to date, no dispositive motion(s) has/have been filed. See generally Carroll v. State of California, No. 1:23-cv-00974 JLT GSA (docket entries).

Given that the four above-referenced, related matters have motions to dismiss that have been fully briefed and are submitted on the papers, in the interests of efficiency, the Court finds that submitting the instant four matters on the papers would best serve the interests of efficiency. Therefore, Plaintiffs will be ordered to file responses to Defendants' motions to dismiss within thirty days. Thereafter, Defendants shall have fourteen days to file their replies, if any, after which, the motions to dismiss will be deemed submitted on the papers.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Within thirty days from the date of this order, Plaintiffs shall file a response to Defendants' motions to dismiss in their respective case;
- 2. Defendants' replies to Plaintiffs' responses to Defendants' motions to dismiss if any shall be filed within fourteen days of Plaintiffs filing their responses, and

¹ The only outstanding motion in <u>Carroll</u> is Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief. <u>See Carroll</u>, ECF No. 23. The Court will screen the Carroll matter in due course.

| | Case 1:23-cv-00973-JLT-GSA Document 27 Filed 10/29/24 Page 4 of 4 | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 1 | 3. The matters will be deemed submitted on the papers fourteen days after Plaintiffs have | | |
| 2 | filed their responses to Defendants' motions to dismiss. | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | | |
| 6 | Dated: October 28, 2024 /s/ Gary S. Austin | | |
| 7 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |
| | 4 | | |